| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | 10/572,636 | SHIN ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Raymond Covington | 1625 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: | _ |
| (1) Raymond Covington USPTO. | (3) | |
| (2) Kay Chang (app rep). | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 25 March 2009 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ⊠ Telephonic □ Video Conference □ Personal (Copy given to: □ Applicant □ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☑ Yes □ No If Yes, provide a brief description: attached. | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: none | | |
| Claims discussed: 1-10 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: none | | |
| Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Applicants agreed to move the product formula (5) from the end of claim 1 to the beginning along with the definition for Y. Claims 1-10 are allowed. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| /Raymond Covington/ Examiner, Art Unit 1625 | | |
| (P | Applicant/Applicant's Representat | ive orginature – ir appropriate) |